THE Reconstructionist

Volume XI. May 11, 1945 Iyar 28, 5705 No. 6

EDITORIALS
- *Franklin D. Roosevelt, Zikrono Li-Berakah*
- *Our New President*
- *Problems Confronting Jewry at San Francisco*
- *A Plea to Dr. Wise and Dr. Silver*
- *On the Publication of Our Sabbath Prayer Book*

ROOSEVELT'S ETHICAL WILL
By Ira Eisenstein

LAMENT FOR OUR DEAD LEADER
By Eugene Kohn

THE JEW AS PUBLIC SERVANT
By Albert I. Gordon

REALITIES AND VALUES *CORRESPONDENCE*

Dedicated to the advancement of Judaism as a religious civilization, to the upbuilding of Israel's ancient homeland, and to the furtherance of universal freedom, justice and peace.

the Reconstructionist

is published bi-weekly for twenty consecutive issues, starting in October, by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, Inc., 15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y. Subscription $2.00 per year; 10c per copy; foreign 25c extra; membership in the Foundation, $5.00 per year, including subscription to *The Reconstructionist*. Reentered as second class matter October 3, 1935, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Chairman: **Mordecai M. Kaplan**
Associate Chairman: **Ira Eisenstein**
Managing Editor: **Eugene Kohn**
Associate Editors: **Israel S. Chipkin, Samuel Dinin, Judith K. Eisenstein, Theodore Friedman, Theodore H. Gaster, Jacob S. Golub, Bernard Heller, Philip Houtz, Samuel C. Kohs, Milton R. Konvitz, Myer S. Kripke, Milton Steinberg, Max Wiener.**

Contributing Editors: **Michael Alper, Nathan A. Barack, Shlomo Bardin, Morton M. Berman, Philip S. Bernstein, Asher Block, Samuel M. Blumenfield, Ben-Zion Bokser, William J. Boxerman, Mortimer J. Cohen, Miriam R. Ephraim, Harry Essrig, Emanuel Gamoran, Judah I. Goldin, Solomon Goldman, Robert Gordis, Emanuel Green, Max Kadushin, Louis M. Levitsky, Theodore N. Lewis, Joshua Loth Liebman, I. D. Minzberg, Edward T. Sandrow, Simon Shetzer, Joshua Trachtenberg, Leo Trepp, Jacob J. Weinstein.**

Secretary: **Hannah L. Goldberg**

AMONG OUR CONTRIBUTORS

DR. ALBERT I. GORDON is Rabbi of Adath Jeshurun Congregation, Minneapolis, Minn.

WITH ALL DUE MODESTY

From a reader in N. J.:

You pack a lot of food for thought in your little magazine. Keep it up.

A UNIQUE FUNCTION

DINNER

in honor of

THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY

of

THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST MAGAZINE

and Reception to

DR. MORDECAI M. KAPLAN

Monday Evening, May 14th, 1945 at 6:30 o'clock

HOTEL COMMODORE, NEW YORK CITY

$10.00 per cover.

Speakers:

Dr. Louis Finkelstein
Dr. Mordecai M. Kaplan
Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr
Dr. Stephen S. Wise

MAKE YOUR RESERVATIONS NOW!

Mr. Harry H. Liebovitz, Chairman
15 W. 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y.

Please make ..... reservations for the Anniversary dinner and reception to Dr. Mordecai M. Kaplan at $10.00 per cover.

Name .....

Address .....

THE
Reconstructionist

Volume XI. May 11, 1945 Iyar 28, 5705 No. 6

EDITORIALS

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, *ZIKRONO LI-BERAKAH*

NEVER before in the history of mankind has the death of a public person so deeply moved vast numbers of the human race as has that of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. No other death has ever left so many people feeling personally bereaved. Multitudes had become familiar with his expressive countenance as flashed on the screen and with the modulations of his voice as it came over the radio in those addresses so aptly characterized as "fire-side talks." People came to feel toward him as toward a friend and neighbor who talked intimately to them about matters close to his heart and to theirs. There was thus added to their appreciation of his statesmanship a warm affection, an emotional loyalty. Not only women and children but also strong men wept when they learned of his death.

An ancient legend has it that God gathers in a special vessel the tears shed on earth and that, when the vessel is filled, the Messiah will come. There can be no doubt that the tears shed for our late President will speed the coming of the Messianic era. They are testimony—much needed testimony in view of the evidence of ruthless and wanton cruelty provided by dispatches from Germany—that men all over the world can be united by a common love of what is truly great and good.

It is not our intention to appraise the greatness of Roosevelt. Standing at the foot of a mountain, one is too near to sketch its contours or estimate its mass. Only after the passing of years has given us a perspective in which to view Roosevelt's career and achievements will it be possible to evaluate them. We can but comment in passing on some aspects of his character and his endeavors.

The heroism of his soul was displayed when he survived the dread disease which almost killed him in the prime of his life. His struggle against the paralysis that attacked his body and that, in a person of less heroic mould, would have invaded his spirit and subjected it to despondency and self-pity, is symbolic of the struggle in which he led the nation and mankind.

When he was inaugurated as President for his first term, the country was in the grip of economic crisis. Productive processes were at a standstill. Depression, amounting almost to despair, seemed to render our whole social and economic organism impotent and inert. Roosevelt

grasped intuitively that the economic crisis was essentially a disease attacking the nerve centers of American life. To combat it required a great act of will, a vigorous affirmation of faith in the nation and its potentialities. Assuring the people that they had "nothing to fear but fear itself," he projected one measure after another for ameliorating conditions and immediately checked the defeatist mood of the nation. Whether all of those projects were wise or not is not here the question. He himself regarded them as more or less tentative and did not hesitate to modify some of them in the course of time. But he conquered the paralysis of the nation. He rallied its will to recovery, to life. He sensitized it to the need for action to abolish poverty and insecurity. He made of government a dynamic factor in developing the health, security and freedom of the people.

In international affairs he played a similar role. Fascism was another and aggravated symptom of that same moral paralysis that had afflicted the nation. It attacked the coordinating nervous system of mankind and prevented the different members of the human race from cooperating for the survival and well-being of the whole. Fascist intimidation had succeeded in almost completely isolating the nations from one another, thereby threatening the whole organism of human civilization.

Roosevelt was among the first to perceive this danger. Courageously disregarding the charge that he was a warmonger, he rallied America's will to live as a member of the human race and to combat fascist aggression. Largely as a result of his leadership, humanity is so far on its way to recovery that, even as we go to press, the Conference of the United Nations to effect a world security organization is opening in San Francisco. Certainly Roosevelt is principally to be credited with having cured America of its paralyzing isolationism and restored it to functioning in concert with other nations of the world.

To be sure, there is still a great way to go before world peace is firmly established. We will miss Roosevelt's presence and wise guidance. But his leadership will not cease with his death. The mass emotion which that tragic event called forth will rather add momentum to the movement for establishing a democratic peace on earth.

We Jews have always felt particularly close to Roosevelt. He understood us and the nature of the attacks upon us. He never hesitated to call upon the services of competent Jewish advisors. Let fascist-minded politicians lampoon his policies by labeling them the "Jew Deal," he would not let that interfere with his utilization of Jewish talent and character in the service of America and of humanity. What a light is cast on the nature of Judaism by the fact that Roosevelt, who bespoke the moral conscience of mankind, was a friend of the Jewish people, while Hitler and his accomplices in the conspiracy against humanity are, to a man, its enemies!

As Americans and as Jews, we are grateful to God for having fashioned the soul of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and having exalted him to leadership in these critical times. May all who have expressed grief at his death remain faithful to his leadership until the task begun by him has been completed. Nothing less will serve as an appropriate monument to his memory than a united world enjoying freedom, security and peace.

OUR NEW PRESIDENT

GRIEVED as we are by the death of our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, we feel that the occasion calls for a word of greeting

and encouragement to Harry S. Truman, who succeeds him as the nation's chief executive. The presidency is, under no circumstances, a sinecure. Under conditions of crisis and war, it is a burdensome responsibility. When it is thrust on a man suddenly, as it has been thrust on President Truman, affording no opportunity for preliminary preparation and orientation to his new duties, the burden of the office must be staggering. And when the new incumbent has as his predecessor a president of the stature of Roosevelt, and knows that the achievements of a Roosevelt will be the measuring rod by which his own are to be judged, he may well stand appalled by the task with which destiny has charged him.

Bearing all these circumstances in mind, we find President Truman's first steps in office very encouraging. He has not evaded issues. He sought no postponement of the San Francisco Conference. He did not side-step the Polish issue. He endorsed unequivocally his predecessor's policies with regard to reciprocal tariffs, the recommendations of the Bretton Woods Conference, and internal social legislation. Of interest to us as Jews is his promise that he would pursue his predecessor's policy in regard to the Jewish Commonwealth. Decisive as was his stand on all these issues, his mode of expression was engagingly modest. No note of truculence, intolerance or officiousness was sounded in any of his speeches. All this has helped allay whatever natural anxiety the nation may have felt in view of the relative obscurity and inexperience of President Truman when compared with Roosevelt at the beginning of his fourth term in office. We wish our new President continued success and we pledge our cooperation in furthering the ideals he has enunciated as guiding his policy.

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING JEWRY AT SAN FRANCISCO

THE United Nations' Conference on International Organization (UNCIO) is opening in San Francisco. The last minute decision of the U.S.S.R. to send Foreign Commissar Molotov will strengthen the Conference and afford the United Nations the possibility of settling a number of disputed points which might otherwise have remained unsettled. But the delegates are not gathering in an atmosphere of "complete" agreement, nor will the Conference usher in a millenium of absolute peace. The question of Polish representation, and a number of other questions remain to be answered. The Conference itself is not intended to be a peace conference or to assure a lasting peace. It is envisaged as providing or initiating the machinery for international cooperation which may help avoid future wars.

It is from this point of view that the Conference should be evaluated. We Jews sincerely hope that it will successfully fulfill its task for we are liable to be the first sufferers in any armed conflict. Nevertheless, we cannot afford to overlook the dangers facing us at this Conference.

The UNCIO plans to avoid certain mistakes made by the old League of Nations. The main power will, therefore, be vested in the Big Three (or Big Five), both in theory and in practice. Necessary as such a step may be, it creates an atmosphere unfavorable to consideration of the rights and prestige, already impaired by the war, of small nations and minorities.

The general enthusiasm for a just settlement of minority problems which developed during and after the first World War, included the Jewish people in its

benefits. It held out to them the promise of a twofold solution: a National Home in Palestine and minority rights in the Diaspora. Now, however, both the background and the general feeling have changed. At the same time, official representation is denied both to the Jewish people and to Jewish Palestine, although the Jewish people were the greatest sufferers in this war, and although Jewish Palestine has been assisting Great Britain and the United Nations from the beginning. Delegates from most of the other small nations, however, will attend. Among them will be those from the Arab states, most of which remained "neutral" until victory was certain, and which recently united to form the Arab League with avowedly anti-Jewish and anti-Zionist intentions. Not that the orientally clad representatives of Ibn Saud or the delegations of other Arab countries will have a direct influence upon UNCIO, but indirectly their presence will strengthen the anti-Zionist attitude, and the Arab propaganda offices being set up in this country will be given the chance to develop their anti-Zionist agitation.

A further danger for Palestine may arise from the problem of mandates and colonies although that problem will probably not come before the Conference officially. In American political circles, a system of "international trusteeship" is favored, whereas Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, and Australia oppose such an arrangement. It is to be expected that some compromise will be reached. The mandate system following World War I was such a compromise. There is danger, however, that, while not precisely mentioning Palestine, some general formula may be adopted which will be detrimental to Jewish interests .

It is most unfortunate that the ambiguous status of Jewry, which is neither that of a nation nor of a religion, but which partakes somewhat of the nature of both has again worked to our disadvantage. Not being a nation, we are not entitled to official representation. Not being a religion, we have no ecclestical organization which can represent all Jewry in appealing to the conscience of the world. Not having decided what status we want for ourselves, we lack any comprehensive communal organization to speak in our behalf. Instead, we are represented by two groups of Jewish organizations with conflicting ideologies, and, though one of these groups represents the bulk of American Jewry and works in close cooperation with the Jewries of other lands, while the other group represents only a small minority, they are both given equal opportunity, to be heard as spokesmen of the Jewish people.

Such being the situation, it is clearly the duty of both groups to try to achieve a "united front" in questions on which practically they do not greatly differ. They should, above all, endeavor to obtain at the Conference a hearing for representatives of the Jewish Agency. The Jewish Agency is officially designated in the Palestine Mandate as the body which is to represent the Jewish people in all matters concerning the Jewish national home. Our historic claim to a Jewish national home in Palestine is acknowledged in the San Remo Treaty. It is, therefore, preposterous that Arab states which have no recognized international claim to Palestine should be given a voice in determining its future, while the Jewish Agency for Palestine is denied even a hearing. A united insistance on the right of the Jewish Agency to be heard at any discussion affecting the future status of Jewish Palestine is the minimum of unity which our two Jewish delegations must achieve in order to avert the dangers which confront us at the San Francisco Conference.

A PLEA TO DR. WISE AND DR. SILVER

AS we go to press, the delegates of many nations, in San Francisco, begin their historic conference. The keynote of all the sessions will undoubtedly be "unity." Now that victory is within our grasp, nothing must be permitted to destroy the unity of the United Nations. No differences must be allowed to loom so large as to obscure the common ideal and the shared need.

American Jewry has been permitted to send two representatives to observe at the Conference and to offer necessary information to the delegates. One observer will represent the American Jewish Conference and one the American Jewish Committee. But, despite the very limited access to the Conference which such representation affords, the simultaneous presence of so many statesmen from all over the world in San Francisco provides an opportunity for the indirect promotion of the political aims of Zionism which should be utilized. But the full utilization of the opportunity is hampered by the disagreements between Dr. Stephen S. Wise and Dr. Abba Hillel Slver and between their respective followers. Thus far, no satisfactory unity has been achieved in their relations.

Some steps have been taken. Resolutions were adopted to find ways and means of patching up the differences. These are necessary first steps, but they will never be followed by other steps, unless the *will to unite* is strong. We are not naive enough to believe that this dispute was born yesterday; and we therefore insist that any attempt to hurl charges and counter-charges will lead only to further recriminations. There must be an end to the disunity. This is the cry heard from one end of the land to the other, a cry issuing from thousands of devoted—and worried—Zionists.

May we suggest that the parties to the dispute follow the tried method of conciliation, or mediation. There are surely impartial Zionists in our midst who could be called in to help iron out the problem. The leading parties in the controversy would, by submitting to such mediation, show a glorious example of humility and personal self-abnegation. The time for such action is *now,* when the fate of Israel hangs in the balance. Future generations will never forgive our own for failing to stand united at this moment. We plead with Dr. Wise and Dr. Silver for immediate acceptance of this proposal.

ON THE PUBLICATION OF OUR SABBATH PRAYER BOOK

THE new Prayer Book, published by the Reconstructionist Foundation has appeared. After several years of preparation, the book is now available for use in the synagogue or in the home. We shall not attempt here to enumerate what we believe to be the virtues of this prayer book. Only an actual examination of its rich contents can do justice to it. But a word of explanation is in order, so that Reconstructionists and non-Reconstructionists alike may understand what its publication implies for the future of the movement as a whole.

In modern times, since Judaism began to express itself through various "denominations," the distinguishing characteristic of a particular "wing" has been its distinctive prayerbook. Thus, for example, the Reform movement, quite early in its career, issued new and revised liturgies for its constituents. The popular assumption may, therefore, be that the Reconstructionist movement has finally emerged as a new—and fourth—party within American Judaism, since this

movement, too, has seen fit to issue its version of the Sabbath prayers.

It is therefore important to remind our readers that Reconstructionism offers a twofold program, an "over-all" program and a "fractional" program. The over-all program is designed to give new vitality to Jewish life as a whole, to organize Jewish communal life so that all elements in Jewry will be represented, to extend and to intensify Jewish education, to cultivate the Jewish arts, to re-Judaize the Jewish home, to raise the ethical standards of the Jewish community, to rebuild the Jewish homeland in Palestine, to make Judaism a force for good in the general American community, and to enrich the content of Jewish worship. In the implementation of these purposes, many groups find it possible to participate with the Reconstructionists. To be sure, some groups in Jewish life, to the extreme left and right, would not subscribe to these activities; but, by and large, the over-all program of Reconstructionism constitutes a unifying force in Jewry.

There is another, namely, a fractional aspect to Reconstructionism, however. It attempts to provide with a philosophy and a program of Jewish religion those who do not find themselves at home in the synagogues and temples as constituted at present. They do not experience in the services as there conducted the religious emotion which they expect. They are disturbed by the fact that they are called upon to recite passages to which they cannot conscientiously subscribe, or are invited to reiterate broad generalities in tiresome repetition. They are looking for an exciting, challenging, uplifting service, in which there is heard the authentic voice of contemporary seekers after truth and goodness as well as the voice of past seekers whose yearnings we still share.

For them, the Reconstructionist Foundation has prepared the prayerbook. This does not mean that a new prerequisite has been added for becoming a good Reconstructionist, namely, making use of the new prayer book. There will very likely be many who are not yet ready for it. There may even be some who will consider the new prayer book the only worthwhile achievement of the Reconstructionist group, and neglect other vital phases of the over-all program. One point must be clear: The fact that some American Jews accept both the fractional and the over-all program should not militate against having all Jews who can unite on the over-all program alone do so. Reconstructionism is *not* a new denomination.

REALITIES AND VALUES

THE WEEK OF MAY 6-13, HAS been designated National Family Week and its observance jointly sponsored by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the Synagogue Council of America. Part of any program for the reconstruction of Jewish life to adapt it to changing conditions must be the reconstruction of Jewish family relations. In the words of Rabbi Sidney Goldstein, chairman of the Synagogue Council's Committee, "A new type of family life is emerging. . . . We are now engaged in democratizing the family just as we are attempting to democratize our economic life. . .. An autocratic form of family organization can never train men and women for a democratic social order."

▼

WE HAVE MORE THAN ONCE referred to the need of utilizing army experience to indoctrinate American service men with the principles of democracy in group relations. We want therefore to commend the War Department for in-

structions issued to 175,000 orientation and education officers of the armed forces about the dangers of native fascism. The order is said to call specific attention to such organizations as the Black Legion and the Silver Shirts and to the similarity of their ideology to nazism. These instructions, however, will be deprived of much of their efficacy as long as there is Jim-Crowism in the organization of our armed forces.

▼

In the village of Hungen in Germany, an American army unit led by a Jewish lieutenant, Robert Shoenfeld, discovered a treasure trove of Jewish literature and art. Works looted from the Rothschild Libraries, the Oppenheim Collection in Frankfurt, the Jewish Historical Museum in Amsterdam and other public and private libraries and art galleries were brought to light. The interesting irony is that these treasures may owe their preservation in spite of the bombing of German cities to the principal theoretician of Nazi anti-Semitism, Dr. Alfred Rosenberg, who assembled them for the use of his "researchers" into the Jewish question. The Jewish National Council of Palestine has decided to ask the United Nations that these and other Jewish cultural treasures looted by the Germans should be sent to Palestine. What "poetic justice" it would be for Dr. Alfred Rosenberg to have contributed indirectly to saving Jewish cultural treasures for the enrichment of the Jewish National Home!

▼

The Negev of Palestine, the very name of which implies an arid, desert region, could attract no settlers but Jews. Only they would have that combination of dogged determination and resourcefulness without which that region cannot, at the present time, sustain any considerable population. Large-scale irrigation projects have been proposed by which the Negev might be converted into fertile agricultural land. But Jewish ingenuity has found other means of raising food in the Negev, even before large-scale projects can be set in motion. Palestinian Jews have learned about hydroponics, a scientific technique for raising plants without soil in a solution of various salts. As a result of a visit from Dr. S. E. Soskin, a Palestinian agricultural expert, there has been organized in New York City the American Friends for Advancement of Intensive Agriculture in Palestine, Inc., which will assist in introducing hydroponics to Palestine. According to Dr. Soskin, that would make possible the immediate colonization by Jews of such regions as the Negev.

▼

The Cleveland Jewish Community Council has suffered a defeat in its controversy with the local Jewish Federation. To our way of thinking, however, the defeat was something of a moral victory. The question at issue was the allocation of funds raised in Cleveland for the Joint Distribution Committee and the United Palestine Appeal. The Community Council favored a 50-50 division, and asked that the community be given an opportunity to express itself on the subject. But the Federation, as the organization that had preempted the field of fund-raising, turned down the suggestion. Later, after the resignation of the chairman of the drive, a special meeting was called which demanded a reconsideration of the allotment by the Federation. At this second meeting the original Federation allocation of 60 per cent for the J.D.C. and 40 for the U.P.A. was sustained by a vote of 24-22, but the closeness of the vote seems an indication that, in the future, Federations will have to pay more attention to Jewish public opinion wherever there are Jewish Community Councils. There lies the moral victory.

Roosevelt's Ethical Will

By IRA EISENSTEIN

THIS was the address which he never delivered, fated to be the last written but never spoken words of our martyred, beloved, gallant President, Frankin D. Roosevelt. In a way, it becomes his final message to us, his parting words, embodying his hopes, his faith, his moral code, his life's ambition. In it, in brief, is the essence of his great state papers. In his posthumously published Jefferson Dinner Address, which was to have been given two days after his death, Franklin D. Roosevelt bequeathed his *tsava-ah,* his ethical will to the children of men.

With tragic irony, it begins: "Americans are gathered this evening in communities all over the country to pay tribute to the living memory of Thomas Jefferson—one of the greatest of all democrats, and I want to make it clear that I am spelling that word 'democrats' with a small 'd'." Little did he realize that those multitudes would be gathered now to pay tribute to him—worthy of that same description.

Jefferson, he went on to say, was "an American citizen of the world." Here, in a word, was Mr. Roosevelt's life-long ideal, to be an American citizen of the world. For those of little vision and less wisdom, this was a contradiction in terms. In their eyes, one could be only a citizen of a country; but in Franklin Roosevelt's eyes, to be a citizen of a country was not enough. All the passionate love one may have for his native land may be transmuted into gall, and hate, and blindness if it be not tempered with the love of Man. For Roosevelt, only he who saw America in the setting of the world was a true citizen of the United States, a real friend of our safety, our prosperity, our honor. This does not mean that one can be a citizen of the world alone, for a man needs roots and hearth and home; he needs the spiritual incentive of having his stake, small or large, in the future of his country. Like Jefferson, even more than Jefferson, Franklin D. Roosevelt was an American citizen of the world.

"Today," he went on to say, "this nation which Jefferson helped so greatly to build, is playing a tremendous part in the battle for the rights of man all over the world." Mark the words: the *rights of man.* Mr. Roosevelt gave deeper meaning and greater stature to those words. The rights of man, for him, were not merely the right to protection against violence. They did not connote the right of the strong to exercise his power unmolested against the weak. The rights of man meant the rights to life, to a livelihood, to security against old age and sickness, security against unemployment and the hazards of an unpredictable and unstable economy. For him, rights meant freedom from fear as well as freedom from want, freedom from that knawing and disintegrating fear which drives the successful to greed and the unsuccessful to despair. The rights of man included the freedom of religion, a freedom which he took very seriously indeed. This was no empty and theoretical right, for he was a deeply pious man. Sophisticated, ultramodern in every fibre of his being, he was yet strongly attached to the historic faith into which he was born. He not only went to church — he prayed. He was not ashamed, even before the millions whom his voice reached, to utter those intimate and fervent prayers which his heart dictated. And he was prepared to fight to the death for the rights of others to the

free exercise of their inherited or chosen faiths.

The rights of *man*: Mr. Roosevelt fixed no barriers to the fullest interpretation of the term "man." He truly believed in the brotherhood of *all* men, of all races and creeds and religions. Perhaps no leader of any nation ever conceived of *man* in broader, more inclusive terms. The worldwide mourning at his death is testimony to that. Statesmen, churchmen, taxi drivers and factory workers, in Australia, China, Russia, South America, from the greatest to the humblest, all loved him, because they knew in their hearts that he loved them. He gave the name to the "forgotten man," who has since been forgotten no longer. Lincoln too loved the common man, and, like Lincoln, Franklin Roosevelt found in him uncommon virtues.

He had faith in the common man, faith in his essential integrity and good sense; and the rights he sought for the common man were rights, therefore, based on no doctrinaire theories of nature, but on the hard, practical basis of the welfare of our nation and of the world. Franklin Roosevelt believed that when the common man achieved his rights, all his rights, most of the evils of society would wither away.

It is easy enough to mouth the words, "the rights of man all over the world." Any politician can pronounce them; but no one remains in our generation who spoke those words with fuller and more heartfelt connotations than he gave to them. He meant, literally, all over the world: in India, in China, in the farthest flung corners of the earth. For he truly believed in the indivisibility of justice. He believed that this was "one world." It is not surprising that Mrs. Wendell Willkie felt bereaved a second time when our President died. She wired to Mrs. Roosevelt: "I cannot help but wonder why men of vision are being taken from the world when we need them most." Willkie and Roosevelt are no more, but the world remains "one world," and waits for its salvation at the hands of those who must rise to the vision of these men.

In the unspoken Jefferson address, Mr. Roosevelt wrote: "Today we have learned in the agony of war that great power involves great responsibility." Here was another great truth articulated for the last time by the immortal statesman—the indestructible bond that ties power to duty. In the discernment of this truth, Mr. Roosevelt reached the heights of the great moral teachers of Israel and of all peoples, at all times. He was not one to disparage power, to look down upon it with disdain as inherently evil. He was no dogmatic pacifist. He did not interpret the verse, "Not by power and not by strength, but by my spirit," to mean the glory of weakness, or even the potency of non-violence. He was a fighter, who gloried in a real battle. But he was vigorous without being belligerent, strong without being a bully. Power, for him, was an instrument, to be used, in the hands of the righteous, for the triumph of righteousness over the forces of evil. He was a realist. He saw, long before many another, the rising and growing menace of fascism, that prototype of social evil, and he dedicated himself to its utter destruction. He knew that such evil understands only one language, the language of power.

He brought our nation to the completest fulfillment of its potential strength. But he saw the moral corollary of that power: the responsibility to use it, not for narrow defense alone, but *"letakken olam b'malkut shaddai,"*—to establish the kingdom of righteousness.

"We as Americans," he continued, "do not choose to deny our responsibility. Nor do we intend to abandon our determination that, within the lives of our chil-

dren and our children's children there will not be a Third World War. We seek peace — enduring peace. More than an end to war, we want an end to the beginnings of all wars — yes, an end to this brutal, inhuman and thoroughly impractical method of settling the differences between governments. The mere conquest of our enemies is not enough. We must go on to do all in our power to conquer the doubts and the fears, the ignorance and the greed which made this horror possible." Thus, behind his passionate hatred of the enemy, Mr. Roosevelt saw the true causes of war: not the madness of this ruler or the fanatical dreams of that dictator, but the underlying greed and the ignorance and fear by which that greed is nourished. The peace he profoundly loved and sought was not, in his eyes, a peace attainable merely by military conquest, but more by the universal understanding of the causes of war.

In this, Roosevelt revealed his fundamental faith in the uses of intelligence. Here was the *liberal* speaking out in unequivocal language. "Today we are faced with the pre-eminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships — the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together in the same world, at peace." The *science of human relationships* — Mr. Roosevelt was charting a new, uncharted sea. Only a great liberal could perceive that the scientific method, so long used to make tanks and ships and planes, to perfect bombsights and flame-throwers, had to be turned to the solution of man's inhumanity to man. A brilliant coiner of slogans, he made no fetish of slogans, of fine-sounding battle cries. Peace, for him, was a problem, a challenge to human ingenuity, human skill, human intelligence. He believed that, if people knew the truth, the truth would make them free. But, like a true social scientist, he recognized that we still do not know the truth, the whole truth; that only if men made a sober, scientific study of wars, could they hope to achieve peace.

Finally, in this *tsava-ah* of his, he called upon us to have faith. "I ask you to keep up your faith. I measure the sound, solid achievement that can be made at this time by the straight-edge of your own confidence and your resolve. And to you and to all Americans who dedicate themselves with us to the making of an abiding peace, I say: The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith." Yes, Mr. Roosevelt was a believer in science, in intelligence; but stronger was his belief that, ultimately, the difference between success and failure lay in the realm of *will*, in that mysterious human equation. The human will must not falter, nor diminish in power or intensity. And it can be strengthened only by faith, faith in the inherent rightness of the right, faith in the doctrine that the intuitions of Jewish and Christian ethics are more than useful hypotheses, that they do indeed constitute the basic laws of God. Without that faith, there is hesitancy, doubt, confusion, defeat. With that faith, no human power on earth can stand in our way.

May his last words never cease to echo in our hearts: "Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

Lament For Our Dead Leader

By EUGENE KOHN

Our Chief is dead . . .
From farm and factory, from shop and home,
From sun-drenched deserts and from wind-swept mountains,
From teeming cities and lone wildernesses,
From ships at sea and planes afloat in air,
Rise mourning voices.

They all remember him now whom he remembered.
All the forgotten men, the lowly folk,
The Oakies from the dust-bowl whom he saved
From a life of vagabondage, sharecroppers
Redeemed from endless serfdom, wage slaves freed
From sweating away their lives for others' gain,
Negroes emancipated but not free,
Whose cause he championed, outcast Jews,
Homeless and haunted by memories of horrors,
For whom he sought a haven and a home—
They all remember him and sob and weep.

O Lord, what shall we do? Where shall we turn?
So long we laid our burdens on his shoulders.
So long we counted on his shepherding
To save us from the ravenous beasts of prey.
When he but beamed upon us with that smile,
That gay and gallant smile we knew so well,
We were ashamed of all the fears and doubts
That plagued our hearts. And when he spoke to us,
His voice so warm and vibrant, calm and steady,
More than his words, assured us we had naught
To fear but Fear, that in us lived a soul
Inviolable, which no demonic fury,
No frothing madness of raving wolf-men could
Intimidate or subdue.

Lord, Thou didst test and try his mettle well
Ere Thou didst charge him with the task to be
Defender of Thy throne against Amalek.
For Thou didst send to wrestle with his flesh
The mighty angel of that dread disease,
With whom, through a night of many nights and days,
He grappled. Yet no anguish and no terror
Could make him curse his God and die. He fought
Pain and despondency, and with the dawn,

Though lame and limping, made the angel yield
And bless him, saying, 'A valiant wrestler thou
With God and man, be thou victorious.'

Thus was he tested and thus was he blest.
Well known to suffering and at home with pain,
His heart was tender and compassionate.
A lover of life, God and his fellow men,
He laughed to scorn all promptings of self-pity.
Grown strong in struggle with his own weak flesh,
He lent his strength for weaker men to lean on.
He served his neighbors and they trusted him,
Seeing in him a servant of the Lord,
A scion of the Messianic line,
Who ever judged with sympathy the poor,
With equity the needy of the land.
The bent reed never feared that he would break it;
The flickering flame that he would quench its light.
He never raised his voice in strident orders,
Nor shouted raucous slogans to the crowd.
But malefactors smote he with his words;
And tyrants fell before his eloquence.

Little we knew, the day we made him chief,
To what titanic tasks, what epic conflicts
God had appointed him. That wicked plot
Of warped and twisted spirits to dethrone God,
And take to them all power, all dominion—
We doubted it could be, so weird it seemed.
But he, our chief, alert in our defense,
Unmasked it to our sight, stirred us to action,
Indued us with his strength and resolution,
Summoned us to the service of the Lord.
In those dread hours when we were near disaster,
And when we reeled under the treacherous blows
Of the aggressor, and our strength ebbed from us,
His steadfast faith rallied our drooping spirits.
The tide of battle turned. The enemy
Grew weak as we grew strong. Our chief's commands
Were leading us to victory, and then,
With victory in sight and all but grasped . . .
How say the bitter words? . . . our chief fell dead.

Why was he snatched so suddenly away,
Leaving us all bewildered and distraught?
Pond'ring this question with a heavy heart,
As though transported from this world of sense,
Entranced, I gazed, and lo! I seemed to stand

In that high hall in which the Lord of Hosts
Holds council with his staff of archangels
And plans his stratagem of war against
Amalek and his cohorts of the damned.
I heard an angel speak and tell his tale
Of the struggle on man's earth. 'The foe,' said he,
'Seems all but vanquished on the battle field.
He is in full retreat, while they that serve
Thy Kingdom have advanced and overrun
The land but lately subject to his vile
And blasphemous rule. Yet is our cause in danger.
For he has strewn about poisonous seed,
And hatches subtle plots to breed dissension
Between united peoples and to set
Race against race and nation against nation.
Villainous men who had incurred the wrath
Of our brave champion the foe has armed
With sly deceits, insidious innuendoes,
And on that day when the united peoples
Will meet to plan the peace that is to be,
These deadly weapons all will be released
And work their havoc. Something must be done
To shield the leader of our hosts, or else,
The foe when routed may more dangerous prove
To our Kingdom's cause than when he took the field.'
He ceased, and a sad silence filled the hall.

Then spoke another of that heavenly council:
'One way remains to foil this dark design.
At any cost, our hero must be protected
Against the shafts of slander aimed at him.
He must be placed forever out of reach
Of all such secret weapons, be transported
Here to our heavenly fortress, and be raised
To a position of command among
The heavenly hosts that battle for the Lord.'

Then a protesting voice, plaintive and sad:
'But what will then befall his hapless folk?
They look to him for faith and confidence,
For sage and prudent counsel. Should he leave them,
Will not the people all, bereaved, bewildered,
Sunk in dejection, slacken in their struggle?
How can we take their trusted leader from them,
Now when they know their destiny for ages
Hangs in the balance?'
To him the High Command,

'Fear not; he still will lead them. They will know
That his translation to the heavenly spheres
Means not that he no longer dwells with them.
His presence will be felt and manifest
Wherever freedom's banner is unfurled.
In reverent awe, they will convey to rest
The worn-out body that so long in pain
He forced to do the bidding of his will.
They will recall his deeds, his legacy
Of noble thoughts and holy purposes.
His spirit will pervade and strengthen them
Making them all immune against the poisons
Which are the last foul weapons of the foe.
Indued with immortality the leader
Will be more potent in his leadership
Than when he dragged his pain-wracked body on earth.
His gay and gallant smile will be reflected
On the bright faces of children in every land,
Children of white, black, red and yellow skins,
For whom my world will be a merry playground.
The warm and vibrant accents of his voice
Will find an echo in the speech of lovers,
Founders of faithful homes, brave simple folk,
Bound each to each in fellowship, and to Me
In pious fealty.

Then the vision faded.
Again the world of sense closed in on me.
The poignant sadness stole into my heart
Again, but mingled now with exaltation.
I felt my leader's presence filling me
With faith and courage, bidding me take heart,
Assuring me that victory was at hand,
And that he had not lived nor died in vain.
An end to weeping then, to sobs and sighs!
Lead on, immortal champion; we follow.

The Jew As Public Servant

By ALBERT I. GORDON

WHEN, on June 5th, 1927, Clarence Chamberlain and Charles Levine completed the trans-Atlantic flight which was to bring them fame, the story is told that a reporter visited the aged father of Charles Levine and related the glad tidings to him. The old man did not seem to comprehend the meaning of the news that had been reported to him. When the reporter asked him, "Aren't you happy to hear that your son was the first man to fly across the Atlantic as a passenger?" Levine, Senior, turned and with a quizzical expression asked, *"Zu vos hot er es gedarft?"* (What did he need that for?)

Some Troubles of an Arbitrator

This story comes to mind because, after some ten years of service in the field of labor arbitration, I have oft-times asked myself the same question: Just why should one undertake to bear the heart-aches that are involved in helping other persons to settle their difficulties when one can just as easily avoid such duties and devote himself entirely to things "religious?" Many friends, aware of the time and energy that I have expending in this field have raised the same question. Usually these friends think in terms of the difficult and trying situations with which I have been confronted in acting as arbitrator in twenty-six different industries within the State as well as serving, almost since its inception, as a public member of the National War Labor Board.

These friends and I are aware of the fact that, in most instances, the arbitrator finds that his position is so difficult because the contracts between the parties are to be interpreted rather than re-written. Hence the personal standards of the arbitrator ofttimes mean little. Under such circumstances neither of the parties may be satisfied with the decision and most frequently the decision, even to the arbitrator is not a "just" one in a moral sense.

Special Troubles of a Jewish Arbitrator

Then too, far too many decisions represent a compromise between the parties, and "cutting a baby in half" is not always just, even though it may be expedient. As if these problems were in themselves not sufficient reason for causing heartache to one who wishes to believe that he is conscientious in carrying out his responsibilities as an arbitrator, the situation is further complicated when the arbitrator happens to be a Jew. In most cases, at least one of the parties to the dispute is dissatisfied with the decision in some degree. I have discovered that he tends to express his disapproval of the arbitrator not simply as arbitrator, but as Jew; that, directly or indirectly, he associates the decision, which to him is unfavorable, with the Jewishness of the arbitrator.

Years ago, after Albert Einstein had published his Theory of Relativity, and before it had been accepted by the world of science, Einstein is supposed to have said: "If my theory proves correct, the Germans will call me a German and the French will call me a citizen of the world. If my theory proves incorrect, the French will call me a German and the Germans will call me a Jew."

Just so, it appears to be with any Jew who places himself in the unenviable position of seeking to be of some assistance in the matter of overcoming or

at least alleviating some of the difficulties that arise between employer and employee.

For the sake of clarification, I should like to point out a few examples of such experiences as tend to support my feeling that whatever the Jew does that proves displeasing to his fellows is regarded as but another example of the invidious character of Jews and Judaism generally.

"The Jew Decision"

Mr. D. had recently moved to Minneapolis from a smaller community. He had established himself in the laundry and drycleaning business and, working with a minimum amount of capital, he soon found himself in a financially precarious situation. He seemed to believe that the only way in which he could continue in business would be to engage in practices that are characterized by the union leaders as "chiseling." This means employees were o b l i g e d to begin their work an hour before they were expected to punch the time-clock and they were obliged to continue their work at the day's end for one hour after they had once again punched their time-cards. In other words, the employer was receiving at least two hours of free labor each day. The union investigated the reports concerning these practices and, finding them true, brought charges againts this "business man." As the permanent arbitator for this industry, I was presented with the evidence in this case and heard the explanations given by the owner of the plant. The evidence was clear and conclusive. Mr. D. was guilty of violating his agreement with the union and under the terms of the contract he was obliged not only to make good the pay he had unlawfully withheld from his employees, but was obliged to pay a heavy fine as well. A decision embodying these terms was rendered. All that remained was for Mr. D. to pay his fine.

One week after the hearing I received a 'phone call from the business agent of this union. He asked to see me at once. When he appeared before me his face was a study in anger. Without saying a word, he quickly withdrew a check from his pocket and tossed it on my desk. I examined the check carefully and noticed that it had been signed by Mr. D. in the full amount as stipulated. However, across the left corner of the check, written in ink in a clear, bold hand, were the following words: "For The Jew Decision Against Me."

"It Might React Upon The Jewish People"

I still recall a dispute to which I listened as a public representative on a tri-partite panel appointed by the National War Labor Board. It was a routine case as cases go. Though the dispute involved one of America's large industrial plants in the Midwest, the other two members of the board, representing capital and labor, were in complete agreement with me upon the disposition of all issues in this case but one. We seemed unable to agree on the question of whether or not a "maintenance of membership" clause should be included in this case. It happens that in this dispute, though not in all cases, I agreed with the union representative that such a clause was necessary.

Before rendering the decision, I entered into a rather lengthy correspondence with the other members of the panel concerning this point of disagreement. Each of the representatives sought to convince me as to the correctness of his point of view. Finally there arrived a letter from the employer representative, himself a "big business" man. After a detailed explanation of his thinking in the case, he added a note which I shall

not soon forget, even though I destroyed his letter for reasons that are self-explanatory. The gist of the letter that so disturbed me read something like the following: "Besides, I do not think that it is a good thing for you to include such a clause as you have in mind, on entirely different grounds. I do not think that it is good for the Jewish people to have business men throughout the country feel that you support the union's argument in favor of 'maintenance of membership.' "

Thus, once again, it was made rather clear to me that I was not acting as just another arbitrator in this or any other case. I was a Jew. Hence, whatever the decision, whatever my reaction, it would be placed to the credit or discredit of the Jewish people as such. Under such conditions it is difficult, if not almost impossible, for a Jew to serve as arbitrator, or indeed to serve in any capacity that involves some relationship with the non-Jewish public. The responsibility, great as it is, becomes almost overwhelming in nature when, upon the decision rendered and obtained, rests not only the opinion that those involved may have of the arbitrator, but their reaction to a people of whom the arbitrator happens to be one.

Lest I give the impression that the tendency to associate the Jewishness of the arbitrator with an unfavorable decision characterizes employers only, let me cite two cases in which the union or its representatives were the offenders.

"That Damned Jew"

I recall a dispute that occurred some time ago, in which the question of the efficiency of certain office help was involved. The employee's case was presented for arbitration by the union. The employer seemed to have a very good reason for discharging this particular employee. In fact, had I depended entirely upon the presentation of the facts as submitted, I could have rendered no decision other than one which would have caused the discharge of the employee. Intuitively, I felt that I had not ascertained all of the facts in the case. Hence I chose to verify some of the information that I had received by communicating with certain witnesses who lived outside of this city. The information thus secured made it clear that the employer had presented me with a series of half-truths. Thus, the decision was rendered in favor of the employee.

I had long ago learned that I was not to expect anyone who had won a favorable decison to thank me. Indeed, I did not expect such treatment. Yet, some six months later, I was quite unprepared for the series of epithets hurled at me by the business agent of the same union in a case involving the same employee.

Because this worker had won the decision in the first case, she acquired the idea that it no longer mattered whether or not she performed her duties in the proper manner. She reasoned that the employer, as the result of my decision, was obliged to retain her in his employ. When her work went from bad to worse, the employer finally discharged her. At once the union came to her defense and presented the case to me for arbitration.

The testimony was quite clear. I could do nothing other than agree that, this time, the employer had sufficient reason for discharging the girl.

Less than a week after this decision had been rendered, I received a series of 'phone calls from the business agents of other unions, some of whom I had not known. In each case it was reported that the aforementioned business agent had, upon receipt of the decision, spent the day making a public denunciation of "that damned Jew."

Once again then, the fact of my Jewishness was associated with an adverse decision. It should be noted that the other business agents had resented this attitude as a matter of abstract justice. It is a matter for conjecture as to whether they would have continued to feel disturbed by such tactics or whether they might not themselves have been guilty of the same offense, had some decision been rendered by me that might have affected them adversely.

"The 'Jewish' Rabbi"

In another dispute which involved a very large union the same tendency manifested itself.

Upon the invitation of both management and the union, I served as the arbitrator for one of the large meat-packing companies of the Midwest for a period of three years. This service was rendered without any remuneration and sometimes involved whole days of travel in the interest of hearing the disputes. The union's own newspaper printed all the news concerning the various disputes and always referred to me as "rabbi." However, one decision proved to be utterly displeasing to the union. Whether or not such displeasure was justified, is not, at the moment, germaine. However, the manner in which this dissatisfaction expressed itself was of special interest to me. This time the union's newspaper in announcing the decision, no longer wrote of me as "rabbi"; rather, it used the words, "the 'Jewish' rabbi." Such a characterization is not here criticized because of its redundancy; it is rather that once again I was face to face with the fact that a displeasing decision calls to mind the Jewishness of the arbitrator, and the inference appears to me to be "What can you expect of a Jew?"

It is true, of course, that such experiences have not occurred in all cases. I have found that, in the main, my decisions have been well received and that recriminations have not been too bitter. After all, no man could stand such pressure over as long a period as I have served in the capacity of labor arbitrator. Even when such experiences have occurred, and these few instances do not, by any means, represent all of the unpleasant incidents that have happened, I have felt duty-bound to continue to accept the responsibility of listening to and rendering decisions in such disputes, because I felt that by so doing I was helping to bring about a better relationship between the parties to the dispute. I am fully aware of the fact that I have not always been able to apply the principles of justice to each and every case, and yet I have always sought to render decisions with the ideal of justice ever before me.

Is Arbitration "Out of Line" With the Rabbinic Function?

Before rendering any decision in a labor dispute, I have always checked my proposed decision against two Biblical statements: "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil" and "Neither shalt thou favor a poor man in his cause." (Exodus 23:2, 3.) I have, for my own purpose, interpreted the word "majority" not only in a liberal manner but as meaning "power" or "wealth" as well. The temptation is always great to render a decision that will be well-received by a powerful union or a large corporaton headed by men rich and influential. I have been equally vigilant to avoid the kind of decision that helps a poor man just because he is poor, rather than because justice is on his side.

Some time ago a friend, who is the president of a large corporation, asked me whether I, as a rabbi, did not find that the work I was doing as an arbitrator was really "out of my line." I opened the Bible to the above quoted

passages and gave him my reasons for feeling that it was my duty as a religious teacher and leader to attempt to overcome the evils that were outlined in these texts. He, and others to whom I have spoken about the problem have seemed not to understand that religion, for me, demands that its teachings and principles be applied to living situations and issues.

Consequently, though confronted time and again by situations and conditions involving mental anguish, I have devoted myself for over a decade to this type of work.

Should Anti-Semitism Deter Jews from Acting as Arbitrators?

Beside the situations just described, others that prove "hard to take" have come to light from time to time. A certain amount of toughness and at times a bit of courage are required. I have tried to meet even such situations without rancor.

For example, what can one do,—what ought one do, in such a case as the following:

Some years ago, there arose a situation in the city of Minneapolis, that was as bad as any that we have known in this community's long history of labor conflict. I was invited by the mayor to act as his representative in seeking to settle one particularly difficult case. Two hot summer months were spent by me in attempting to bring the dispute to a peaceful conclusion. Neither the union nor its representatives, nor the employer was Jewish, yet when I, in a triumphant mood, brought the news to the employer that I had finally settled the strike and that work would be resumed at once, this employer had the effrontery to inform me that this strike, as well as all other strikes in this city, had been engineered by Jews. This employer had known me for many years; yet there was no hesitancy in repeating the vile and untruthful statements and accusations made by all anti-Semites. One has to accept such situations and even ignore them, if one is to continue to be of any service to the community.

Some years ago when the Silver Shirts and other anti-Semitic organizations were most active in this community, I found it necessary, on the occasion of a public address, to turn the spotlight of attention on them. Not long after, thousands of hand-bills were distributed throughout the city, in bold black type, asking: "Why, Rabbi Gordon, do you control the unions of Minnneapolis and have men in their offices doing your bidding?" The inference, of course, was that all labor trouble in this community was in reality due to my machinations. I was vulnerable in this attack, because, as a Jew, I had served what I considered to be the public interest in this field of activity.

I know of nothing that one can do other than to try to maintain one's equilibrium and to continue to serve, to the best of one's ability, wherever one's service can be utilized to the greatest advantage.

The Problem of Jewish Participation in Public Life

These experiences seem to me to focus attention once again upon one of the most important issues confronting American Jews today. Shall we refrain from participation in public life, from accepting responsibility, offices or duties that tend to focus attention upon us as Jews? If we refrain from performing such duties are we, as some claim, actually helping our fellow-Jews to avoid unfavorable and undesirable attention? And if we do participate, are we not helping to make the lot of our people even more difficult to bear in these trying times?

The problem remains the same, whe-

ther it be a lowly individual in a Midwestern community or whether it be a Hillman, Dubinsky, Cohen, Rosenman, or Frankfurter, that is involved. The last Presidential campaign, in which the slogan, "Clear it with Sidney," was used, was just the latest in a long series of malicious side-swipes at the Jewish people, resulting from the fact that Jews were and are participating in the affairs of their communities, their state and their nation.

There are, of course, many who believe that Jews ought not to participate in public affairs. They do *not* argue that Jews should *never* enter into such activities; rather, they say that during such chaotic times as these, Jews ought to stay out of participation in any form of public life. If we are to be influenced by this type of reasoning, it would follow logically that no Jew ought ever to accept even the lowliest office or engage in any activity in which he may come in contact with non-Jews. For the anti-Semite will have none of us. He can, and will, and usually does make an issue out of Jewish participation in public affairs whenever it suits his purpose.

Some time ago, a Jewish friend, who was active in the Parent-Teachers Associaiton of the school which his children attended, was accused by certain non-Jewish members of doing the Jewish people a disservice because he was "too active" in the association's affairs. Another friend found himself elected to a responsible post in the automobile industry. At once he became the target of anti-Jewish attack because he also proved to be "too active."

"Jews should know their place," we are told. What these persons mean, who make such a statement, is that, inasmuch as some so-called Americans regard us Jews as second-class citizens, we ought to accept their definition of Americanism and refrain from participation in any and all activities that would tend to bring us in contact with the non-Jewish world. It should be easy to see that to follow such advice is, in reality, to commit political suicide.

There can be no real distinction between one form of public service and another. From Justice Frankfutrer to the lowliest lawyer working in Washington; from the national labor leader, to the citizen in any community who takes his political responsibility seriously; from the Jewish owner of a large department store to the lowliest of Jewish merchants —it matters not what the position—the attitude on the part of those who do not like Jews will always remain the same. We shall be attacked and maligned whenever it suits the purpose of these enemies of democracy.

A Duty to Americanism and Judaism

To play into the hands of these people by refraining from meeting our responsibilities as American citizens is to help weaken and finally destroy the kind of America that the Founding Fathers sought to establish. To create for ourselves a new ghetto in these United States just because there are voices, loud and raucous, crying out against us, is to help bring about the final defeat of democracy.

Why shall we, who seek to offer conscientious service, be obliged to endure the heartaches and bitter experiences that accompany such public service as we may perform? The answer is clear. It is our responsibility to prevent America from becoming what our enemies want it to be — a land in which *all* minorities, including the Jewish, will live by sufferance, and not by right. We owe a duty too, to the many decent Americans, who

believe as we do, that America must remain a "land of the free" for all of its citizens; that, regardless of race, color, or creed, all men are created by the same God and all men are His children.

For those of us to whom the Jewish religion is a basic and primary force in our lives, there is yet another reason why we must, whatever the personal sacrifice, continue to serve, whenever and wherever circumstance dictates. Ideals of justice and peace can never be approximated, let alone attained, if we Jews refrain from lending our every effort towards their attainment. We may pray for a world of justice, of peace, of brotherhood, but we ought to know by now that even our prayers must be implemented by action, by service, by deeds that will help to hasten the day when the ideals of our religion may be realized.

We must risk intolerance and prejudice. We must continue to serve wherever our service is required. The America of Washington, of Jefferson, of Lincoln, demands it of us. We must refuse to become second-class citizens; the lovers of true democracy demand this of us. We Jews, here in America as everywhere else, constitute a bulwark against the forces of darkness. To hesitate now, to question the advisability of continuing the work we perform within our communities for reasons of personal convenience or expediency, is to strengthen the forces of evil that exist in our day. We dare not refrain from helping, in any way we can, to bring about a better world for tomorrow, because to refrain would constitute a violation of the principles of our people and our faith. Let it not be said of this generation of Jews that we have not the moral stamina and courage to meet the challenge of these trying days.

Correspondence

On the Attitude of Jews to Other Abused Minorities

Sirs:

In your issue of February 23rd there appeared a brilliant and illuminating article, "Social Ideals and Ethics for the Jew of Our Time," by Rabbi Jacob Weinstein. I wonder if you will grant me the privilege of commenting, briefly, upon one particular section of the paper, "Utilizing the American and Jewish Traditions." In this section, the rabbi asks, "Do you fight for the civil liberties of unpopular folk like Minneapolis Trotskyists, or Mrs. Earl Browder, or Jehovah's Witnesses or exiled Japanese-Americans? You will not listen to the smug advice of more cautious folk 'not to bang your head against a stone wall.' "

These are brave and inspiring words. Nevertheless, the ultra-cautious individual is chary of accepting such a challenge.

Let me illustrate from personal experience. The great local issue of the day in California is the return of Japanese-American evacuées. They are being released from the relocation centers and those who desire to do so may return to their homes, their farms, their properties, their jobs. There is no question of legality. The Supreme Court has decided in favor of their return to the West Coast.

Ministers of every denomination, representatives of the Catholic Church, priests and laymen and a few rabbis, as well, have banded together in such groups as the Council for Civic Unity to promote the peaceful return and re-orientation of these citizens to the Pacific Coast area.

There has been considerable opposition to their return. "Boycott" organizations have been formed. Shameful deeds of violence have been prepetrated upon the property and persons of individual evacuées. Some misguided officials of the local and state government have aligned themselves with the provocative and law-breaking elements in various communities. Nevertheless, incidents involving threat and coercion are becoming fewer and fewer and there is every reason to hope that, in due course of time, these former citizens and inhabitants of the state will be assimilated satisfactorily.

The cautious to whom Rabbi Weinstein refers, ("You will not listen to the smug advice, etc."), are fearful and panicky. I mean the cautious in the ranks of our co-religionists. There are cautious elements in the rest of the community and they are highly critical of the church, cathedral and synagogue for their ecclesiastical endorsement of the Constitution of the United States. My

ministerial friends tell me of conversations and debates and discussions with some of their members and friends. Nevertheless, they are not to be deterred, perhaps, because a large segment of popular opinion within their churches and outside, supports them.

It is a different picture within the Jewish community. As one of the self-styled experts on anti-defamation expressed it, "They are not gunning for Jews. They are gunning for Japs, so why should we stick our necks out. The people that hate the Japs will hate the Jews who stick up for the Japs. The net result will be an increase of anti-Semitism."

I submit that this expressed attitude which is quite general among our people in this area, is both craven and dangerous. It is symptomatic of a certain type of Jew, all too numerous, in many of our American communities. Their attitude is dangerous in this respect, as I see it: it repeats all the mistakes of all the liberal elements of pre-war Europe and especially of pre-war Germany.

This is the crux. What happens to minority group A is of no concern to minority group B. What happens to the Jews is a Jewish problem (and there are some who would delimit it to the locality in which anti-Semitism is rife). What happens to the Catholics in a predominantly Protestant milieu, is a Catholic problem. What happens to the Czechs is a Czech problem. . . . Let the Negroes worry about their difficulties; and if Japanese-Americans have trouble returning to their rightful homes, well, that's their lookout.

It would seem that a problem which relates to one minority on the American scene, could relate, at some future time, to another minority. Anti-Japanese prejudice is only one of a choice assortment of violent and hateful attitudes which have been in the past and may be in the future directed against other minorities.

Should not our people, of all peoples, have learned the lesson by this time? . . . I used the word "craven" in connection with the attitude of some of our over-cautious *"landsleut."* This is what I mean. We have been eternal protestants against injustice, and not without reason. We have a glorious tradition which dates back to the literary prophets of Israel. Again, we have been the victims of injustice and intolerance from the time of our emergence as a people down to the present. We have been hurt, hunted, persecuted, murdered, dispossessed. Therefore, we should be mentally and spiritually equipped to act as spokesmen for all who are so unfortunate as to go through similar experiences.

If we remain silent while others suffer, how can we expect a hearing at the bar of public opinion? If we refuse to come to the rescue of the harassed and homeless, how can we lay claim to sympathy and consideration? Have we fallen to such low estate that the sum and substance of Jewish life is self-protection, self-justification, self-assistance? Is this the mark of differentiation between the Jew and his fellows, that he cries out when he is hurt, but remains silent, trembling and fearful, when his neighbor is injured?

Let our cautious brethren take a lesson from those brave non-Jewish souls in the occupied countries of Europe, who risked life and limb, for the sake of Jewish souls and salvaged many.

Let them not be fearful of aligning themselves on the side of those who support the Constitution and defend Civil and Religious Liberty. *"Noblesse oblige"* applies to the Jew. He, the foremost victim of injustice, is obligated to work ceaselessly for the reign of righteousness and truth. There may be some risk in this. He cannot remain neutral and accomplish anything. He may have to consent to stand up and be counted; but let him not be alarmed. Those who are for him, for what he represents (if it be the right) are more than those who are against him. And the number of men and women, dedicated to a better nation, a better world and a brighter future for mankind, is growing every day.

Finally it seems to me that the experience of our times dictates a united and realistic approach to the problem of anti-defamation. I use this term not in its limited, sense which applies it to the defense of Jewish rights. I utilize it, rather, in its classical interpretation. Every minority group is concerned with the problem of public relations. The Jew is not alone among national or religious or cultural groups which have been and are being defamed and abused. Each group has its agency to answer unfair, unkind, ill-considered and vituperative charges against it.

Perhaps the time has come (I think it is long overdue) for a kind of a super Anti-Defamation Organization, dedicated to the principles embodied in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Now, is the time for all minority groups to get together for the defense of all minorities. If each minority pursues its special and limited goals, it will never reach them. If, united, they go after a common objective, the new and brighter day the prophets foretold, will be here.

NORMAN M. GOLDBURG
Chaplain (Reserve) U.S.A.
Temple B'Nai Israel
Sacramento, Calif.